



<sup>12</sup> We copy from the Washington Union of Jan. 28th, the Address written and reported by Mr. CALHOUN, from the Committee of fifteen, and adopted by a majority of the Convention.

THE ADDRESS  
OF SOUTHERN DELEGATES IN CONGRESS  
TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

We, whose names are hereunto annexed, address you in discharge of what we believe to be a solemn duty, on the most important subject ever presented for your consideration. We allude to the conflict between the two great sections of the Union, growing out of a difference of feeling and opinion in reference to the relation existing between the two races, the European and African, which inhabit the Southern section, and the acts of aggression and encroachment to which it has led.

The conflict commenced not long after the acknowledgement of our independence, and has gradually increased until it has arrayed the great body of the North against the South on this most vital subject. In the progress of this conflict, aggression has followed aggression, and encroachment encroachment, until they have reached a point when a regard for your peace and safety will not permit us to remain longer silent. The object of this address is to give you a clear, correct, but brief account of the whole series of aggression and encroachment on your rights, with a statement of the dangers to which they expose you. Our object in making it is not to cause excitement, but to put you in full possession of all the facts and circumstances necessary to a full and just conception of a deep seated disease, which threatens great danger to you and the whole body politic. We act on the impression, that in a popular government like ours, a true conception of the actual character and state of a disease is indispensable to effecting a cure.

We have made it a joint address, because we believe that the magnitude of the subject required that it should assume the most impressive and solemn form.

Not to go further back, the difference of opinion and feeling in reference to the relation between the two races, disclosed itself in the convention that framed the constitution, and constituted one of the greatest difficulties in forming it. After much effort, it was overcome by a compromise, which provided, in the first place, that representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the States according to their respective numbers; and that, in ascertaining the number of each, five slaves shall be estimated as three. In the next, that slaves escaping into States where slavery does not exist, shall not be discharged from servitude, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom their labor or service is due. In the third place, that Congress shall not prohibit the importation of slaves before the year 1808; but a tax not exceeding ten dollars may be imposed on each imported. And finally, that no capitation or direct tax shall be laid, but in proportion to federal numbers; and that no amendment of the constitution, prior to 1808, shall affect this provision, nor that relating to the importation of slaves.

So satisfactory were these provisions, that the second, relative to the delivering up of the fugitive slaves, was adopted unanimously, and all the rest, except the third, relative to the importation of slaves until 1808, with almost equal unanimity. They recognise the existence of slavery, and make a specific provision for its protection where it was supposed to be the most exposed. They go further, and incorporate it, as an important element, in determining the relative weight of the several States in the government of the Union, and the respective burdens they should bear in laying capitation and direct taxes. It was well understood at the time, that, without them, the constitution would not have been adopted by the Southern States, and, of course, that they constituted elements so essential to the system that it never would have existed without them. The Northern States knowing of this, ratified the constitution, thereby pledging their faith, in the most solemn manner, sincerely to observe them. How that faith has been kept, and that pledge redeemed, we shall next proceed to show.

With few exceptions of no great importance, the South had no cause to complain prior to the year 1819—a year, it is to be feared, destined to mark a train of events, bringing with them many, and great, and fatal disasters to the country and its institutions. With it commenced the agitating debate on the question of the admission of Missouri into the Union. We shall pass by for the present this question, and the third, relative to the importation of slaves until 1808, with almost equal unanimity. They recognise the existence of slavery, and make a specific provision for its protection where it was supposed to be the most exposed. They go further, and incorporate it, as an important element, in determining the relative weight of the several States in the government of the Union, and the respective burdens they should bear in laying capitation and direct taxes. It was well understood at the time, that, without them, the constitution would not have been adopted by the Southern States, and, of course, that they constituted elements so essential to the system that it never would have existed without them. The Northern States knowing of this, ratified the constitution, thereby pledging their faith, in the most solemn manner, sincerely to observe them. How that faith has been kept, and that pledge redeemed, we shall next proceed to show.

With few exceptions of no great importance, the South had no cause to complain prior to the year 1819—a year, it is to be feared, destined to mark a train of events, bringing with them many, and great, and fatal disasters to the country and its institutions. With it commenced the agitating debate on the question of the admission of Missouri into the Union. We shall pass by for the present this question, and the third, relative to the importation of slaves until 1808, with almost equal unanimity. They recognise the existence of slavery, and make a specific provision for its protection where it was supposed to be the most exposed. They go further, and incorporate it, as an important element, in determining the relative weight of the several States in the government of the Union, and the respective burdens they should bear in laying capitation and direct taxes. It was well understood at the time, that, without them, the constitution would not have been adopted by the Southern States, and, of course, that they constituted elements so essential to the system that it never would have existed without them. The Northern States knowing of this, ratified the constitution, thereby pledging their faith, in the most solemn manner, sincerely to observe them. How that faith has been kept, and that pledge redeemed, we shall next proceed to show.

After a careful examination, truth constrains us to say, that it has been by a clear and palpable evasion of the Constitution. It is impossible for any provision to be more free from ambiguity or doubt. It is in the following words: 'No person held to service or labor, in one State, under the law there-of, escaping into another State, shall in consequence of such law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.' All is clear. There is an uncertain and equivocal word to be found in the whole provision. What shall not be done, as what shall be done, are fully and explicitly set forth. The former provides that the fugitive slave shall not be discharged from servitude by any law or regulation of the State wherein he is found, and the latter that he shall be delivered up on claim of his owner.

We do not deem it necessary to undertake to refute the sophistry and subterfuge by which so plain a provision of the Constitution has been evaded, and, in effect, annulled. It constitutes an essential part of the constitutional compact, and of course of the supreme law of the land. As such, it is binding on all the federal and State governments, the States and the individuals composing them. The sacred obligation of compact, and the solemn injunction of the supreme law, which legislators and judges, both federal and State, are bound by oath to support, all unite to enforce its fulfillment, according to its plain meaning and true intent. What that meaning and intent are, there was no diversity of opinion in the better days of the republic, prior to 1819. Congress, State legislatures, State and federal judges and magistrates, and people, all spontaneously placed the same interpretation on it. During that period, none interposed impediments in the way of the owner seeking to recover his fugitive slave; nor did any deny his right to have every proper facility to enforce his claim to have him delivered up. It was then nearly as easy to recover one found in a northern State, as one found in a neighboring southern State. But this has passed away, and the provision is defunct, except perhaps in two States.

When we take into consideration the importance and clearness of this provision, the evasion by which it has been set aside, may fairly be regarded as one of the most fatal blots ever cast by the South and the Union. This cannot be more easily proved than directly stated that it has been by two learned judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. In one of his decisions, Judge Story said: 'Historically it is well known that the object of this clause was to secure to the citizens of the slaveholding States, the complete right and title of ownership in their slaves, as property, in every State of the Union, in which they might escape from the State wherein they were held in servitude.' 'The full recognition of this right and title was indispensable to the security of this species of property in all the slaveholding States, and, indeed, was so vital to the preservation of their interests and institutions, that it cannot be doubted that it constituted a fundamental article, without the adoption of which the Union would not have been formed. Its true design was to guard against the doctrines and principles prevalent in the non-slaveholding States, by preventing them from interfering with, or restricting or abolishing the rights of the owners of slaves.'

Again. 'The clause was therefore of the last importance to the safety and security of the Southern States, and could not be surrendered by them without endangering their whole property in slaves. The clause was accordingly adopted in the Constitution by the unanimous consent of the framers of it—a proof at once of its intrinsic and practical necessity.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere with, in any way.'

Again. 'The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can interfere

## WHOLE NO. 943.

## THE LIBRATOR.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY  
SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was held in Faneuil Hall, Boston, on Wednesday, Jan. 21.

The chair was taken by FRANCIS JACKSON, President of the Society, at 11 o'clock, A. M., who called the meeting to order, and gave opportunity for vocal or silent prayer.

Voted, That SAMUEL MAY, JR., CORNELIUS BRAMHALL, and ELIZA J. KENNY, be Assistant Secretaries of the Society.

Other matters prepared to lay before our Delegates in Convention were adopted in con-

those present. Of

any justly complain-

ation to their atro-

men or where has a

willing to publish

in its columns,

the reason is

only exists between

and criminality.

John C. Cal-  
lighout. It is an at-  
tempt of acting treacher-  
ous and of seeking to do-  
cipes too much room

in it, to-day; but it

is worthy of animadver-

others plausible, and

tempt to recover a-

cties, cannot now be

elt, heavily pecuniary

to itself—whereas

o recover one found

in neighboring

indeed changed,

in place in public

not another slave

her agains law or

of New England, to

, and hurried back

for a slave-hun-

s quarter; and for

the famous Latimer

to recapture a fugi-

or judicial action,

onal claims of the

. But, in the com-

Hide the outcast,

as a strong hold

than any article

as one of the most

ard. Most clearly,

they can no longer

probit, no longer

but are BOUND

DISSOLVED, and

ing and treacherous

they do not mean

ative left, if they

conscience and from

their present

with hell."

which denies to Con-

in the District of

1787 to Cal-

referred by the ex-

and by the political

ch emanates, the

moderate, not to

and non-committal

to be pursued by

opposition in the

by a strict par-

it concludes sim-

in human flesh

to all take nece-

any—to stay the

turnity'; and says

one will then have

course to adopt!!

we never seen an

than this, or the

elous' more sum-

ble division that

the fact that but a

and represent-

dress, and these,

members of one

of the Address-

it is evident

in the pan-

to arrest the move-

ers out of the

or this fresh token

velocity. The

dispirited; its

there is mutiny in

ONE LAST, BEST

a redoubled zeal

;

their date;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;



From the National Era.

## THE PEACE CONVENTION AT BRUSSELS.

By JOHN G. WHITTIER.

Still in thy streets, O Paris! doth the stain  
Of blood defy the cleansing rain;  
Still breaks the smoke Messini's ruin through,  
And Naples mourns that new Bartholomew,  
When squallid beggary for a dole of bread,  
At a crown'd murderer's beak of license, fed  
The yawning trenches with her noble dead;  
Still, doomed Vienna, through thy stately halls,  
The shell goes crashing, and the red shot falls,  
And leagued to crush thee on thy Danube's side,  
The bearded Croat and Bosniak spearman ride;  
Still in that vale where Himmeray's snow  
Melts round the cornfields and the vines below,  
The Sikk's hot cannon, answering ball for ball,  
Flames in the breach of Moulton's shattered wall,  
On Chemnitz's side the culture seeks the slain,  
And Sutlej paints with blood its banks again.

'What folly, then,' the faithless critic cries,  
With sneering lip, and wise, world-knowing eyes,  
'While fort to fort, and post to post,  
The ceaseless challenge of the war-drums' beat,  
And round the green earth, to the church-hells' charms,

Of nations drunken with the wine of blood,  
Staggering to take the Pledge of Brotherhood,  
Like tippler's answering Father Mathew's call,  
The sultry Spaniard and the mad-cap Gaul,  
The bulldog Briton yielding but with life,  
The Yankee swaggering with his Bowie-knife,  
The Russ from banquets with the vulture shared,  
The blood still dripping from his amber bead,  
Quitting their mad Berserker dance to hear  
The dull, meek droning of a drab-coat seer;

Leaving the sport of Presidents and Kings,  
Where men for dice each titled gambler flings,  
To meet alternate of the Scine and Thame,  
For tea and gossip, like old country dames.

No! let the cravens plead the weaking's cant,

Let Cobden cipher, and let Vincent rant,

Let Sturge preach peace to democratic throngs,

And Burritt, thumping through his hundred tongues,

Repeat to all his ghostly lesson o'er,

Timed to the pauses of the battery's roar,

Check Ban or Kaiser with a barricade

Of 'Olive Leaves' and 'Resolutions' made,

Spikes guns with pointed scripture-texts, and hope

To capsize navies with a wind tropic;

Still shall the glory and the pomp of War

Along their train the shouting crowds draw;

Still dusty Labor to the passing Brave

His cap shall doff, and Beauty's kerchief wave;

Still shall the Bard to vane his song,

Still hero-worship kneel before the Strong;

Rosy and sleek the sable-gown divine,

O'er his third bottle of suggestive wine,

To plumb'd and sworded auditors shall prove

Their trade accordant with the Law of Love;

And Church for State, &amp; State for Church, shall fight,

And both agree, that Might alone is Right!

Despite of sneers like these, oh, faithful few!  
Who dare to hold God's word and witness true,  
Whose clear-eyed faith transcends our evil time,  
And o'er the present wilderness of crime

Sees the calm Future with its robes of green,

Its fleece-flocked mountains, &amp; soft streams between;

Still keeps the path which duty bids you tread,

Though worldly-wisdom shake its cautious head.

No truth from Heaven descends upon our sphere,

Without the greeting of the skeptic's sneer,

Denied and mocked till its blessings fall

Common as dust and sunshine over all.

Then o'er Earth's war-field, till its strife shall cease,

Like Morvan's harpers, sing your song of peace!

As in old fable sing the Thracian's lyre

Midst howl of fiends and roar of penal fire,

Till the fierce din to pleasing marmurs fell,

And love subdued the maddened heart of hell.

Loud, once again, that holy song aongue,

Which the glad angels of the Advent sung,

Their cradle-anthem for the Saviour's birth,

Glory to God, and peace unto the earth!

Through the mad discord send that calming word

Which wind and wave on wild Genesear heard

Lift in Christ's name His Cross against the Sword!

Not vain the vision which the prophets saw,

Skirting with green the fiery waste of war,

Through the hot sand-gleam looming soft and calm

On the sky's rim the fountain-shading palm.

Still lives for earth which fiends so long have trod,

The great hope resting on the truth of God—

Evil shall cease, and Violence pass away,

And the tired world breathes free through a long Sabbath day.

## A SONG.

BY WILLIAM WALLACE.

Where is my Native Land?  
Where the East sparkles?  
Where the wide, wooded West  
By the sea darkles?  
Where the soft, sunny South,  
Like a bright glowing,  
Sees the proud sun in state  
To her couch going?  
Where is my Native Land?

That is my Native Land  
Where the East sparkles;  
Where the wide, wooded West  
By the sea darkles.  
South and the North! alike  
Ye claim my being;  
All races are the same  
To the All Seeing.  
Down with the feudal lie!  
Man is my brother;  
God is my Father, and  
Earth is my Mother.  
The World is my Native Land!

## THE AWAKENING.

When freemen assemble  
In virtue united,  
The proud tyrants tremble,  
Like doves when affrighted;  
They know that the day  
Of their tyrannous sway,  
Like the mist of the morning, is passing away.

Lo! Freedom awakens!  
The tyrant is smitten!  
His palace is shaken.  
His sentence is written!  
On Columbia's sod,  
Long polluted with blood,  
It is written in fire by the finger of God!

The tocsin is sounding  
For Fresonam's rally;  
The shout is resounding  
From hill top and glen  
It re-echoes again—  
Free Spirits, Free Labor, Free Soil, and Free Men!

[Western Citizen.]

## Reformatory.

## THE BIBLE DISCUSSION.

## GOD JUST. THE BIBLE TRUE. FAILIBLE MAN'S CONSTRUCTIONS OF IT ERRONEOUS.

HENRY C. WRIGHT:

DEAR FRIEND—Most sincerely do I assure you that my intellect and heart appreciate the kind and candid spirit of your letter. You ask, very properly, 'For what error or sin do you wish God to grant me remittance?' I reply, not, as you apprehend, for believing that it is unjust for God to punish with death the human being for the crime of another, but for unswervingly, as I conceive, inferring this injustice from the writings of the Old Testament, and for representing as unjust, what the Bible represents as the acts of the Almighty, in commanding that persons should be put to death as the consequence of the crime of others.

Firmly believing the divine sovereignty, and that God worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, I as firmly believe in the perfect and eternal righteousness of that sovereignty and will. The appeal to his intelligent creatures, 'Are not my ways equal?' proves that the glory of his nature and character consists in his conformity to eternal righteousness, and that what he does is not right primarily, independently of all law or moral principle, simply because he does it, but that he does it because it is right.

I fully accord with you that it is palpable injustice to punish with death, (or with any thing else,) one human being for the crime of another. I assure you, that, rather than believe this, I would admit that the compiler of the book of Joshua was mistaken. I shall endeavor to prove that no such alternative is before us.

The question you present me, dear sir, for special attention, is, 'Has God a right to order men to be stoned to death, and their bodies burned to ashes, as a penalty for a crime which they never committed?' If by this you mean as a penalty due to them, I answer in the negative; but if you only mean, as a penalty due to the actual transgressor, I answer in the affirmative. God, as the Author and Owner of life, had a right to decree that David's child should die as a penalty due to David for his adultery, but no right to decree its death as a penalty due to the infant for the father's sin.

You overlook, I think, the important difference between God's commanding persons to be put to death as the penalty due to others for their sins, and commanding them to be put to death as the penalty due to them for the crimes of others. God commanded that the Canaanitish infants should be put to death, not as a penalty due to them for their own crimes, or the crimes of others, but as a penalty due to their parents who had sinned. Deut. 9: 4. In the one case, persons are punished as guilty of sins which they never committed; in the other, they suffer in consequence of such sins.

I cannot admit that you have proved Acham's children to be innocent in respect to their father's crime. Are we to suppose that this sacred book represents, as your view implies, that Samuel, who slew Agag, was an enthusiastic man-slayer, and that Saul lost his kingdom for refusing to commit murder? Was the life of David, who is represented as a man after God's own heart, one continuous perpetration of wholesale murder? Were Caleb and Joshua commanded for determining that God's children should be put to death, not as a penalty due to them for their own crimes, or the crimes of others, but as a penalty due to their parents who had sinned?

What now is the question at issue between us? We agree that it is not right to punish the innocent for the crimes of the guilty. We also agree that 'children die in consequence of the sins of their parents.' The question is, Can God justly command men to put persons to death as a consequence of the sins of others? Could it justly command that the children of Acham, or of Canaan, should be put to death as a consequence of the sins of their parents? You remark, in respect to that 'suffering and death' which comes 'as a consequence of the sins of others,' rather than to punish us for those sins, (here you make the very distinction I have stated,) God never uses man as an agent to inflict such suffering and death.' You admit that it is just for God to use the natural elements, but affirm that it is unjust to use man for this purpose. This is the injustice, therefore, does not consist in this establishment of his claim to divine authority to assemble the saints at Naouvo? If Moses was mistaken in respect to God commanding him to slay the Canaanites, as you suppose, he certainly might have been mistaken in respect to God revealing to him that he would 'raise up a prophet like unto' himself, &c., and the Israelites could have no assurance of this prediction of the Saviour of the world! Neither could they have confidence in his testimony respecting sacrifices or the forgiveness of sin. I beg you to consider also, that the New Testament writers recognize Moses as a truthful writer, 'faithful in all his house,' a singular testimony of a man, who was continually ignorantly perpetrating moral wrong and murder, as your theory implies! Jesus Christ himself sanctions this truth very 'writings' which contain the records of the deeds you condemn, teaching that believing Moses is inseparable from believing in himself. John 5: 45, 47. Paul represents those very acts which you denounce as unjust, as the fruits of faith in God! Heb. 11: 34. He represents that law as righteous, which the command to put persons to death on account, or in consequence of the sins of others, is synonymous with charging them with guilty of those sins? Was the taking of the life of David's child, 'because of his sin, synonymous with charging the child with the father's guilt? Was the commanding of the stoning of Acham's children, (admitting their innocence in the case,) treating them as guilty of that act, any more than the Lord's opening the earth to swallow up the 'little ones' of Korah, &c., was treating them as guilty of their father's rebellion? Was the destruction of infants by the flood, or by the flames of Sodom, a punishment to them for their parents' sins? Were the sufferings and deaths of all the Egyptians a punishment to all, young and old, for Pharaoh's sin? Do you say that these things could not be otherwise, so long as effects follow causes, and the laws of the physical universe are in operation, &c.? Were the flood and raining of fire and brimstone on Sodom, and all the plagues of Egypt, nothing more than the operations of 'fixed, unchanging (physical) laws'? Was there no special divine control in these cases? Could it not be otherwise than that the 'little ones' of Korah, &c., should be swallowed up with their fathers? Could not these 'little ones' have been included in the general command to separate from these men, without violating physical law? Will you affirm that the opening of the earth at that particular spot, at that particular period, just sufficient to swallow up that particular company, was an ordinary earthquake, the effect of natural causes, without any special interposition or control of the Almighty? The alternative is clearly before you. You must deny the facts, or abandon your theory of justice. Is it not so?

Suppose you deny the facts. Of what avail will it be, so long as you see and acknowledge that 'men may and do die in consequence of the sins of others?' You admit that there is no injustice in this, when it is the effect of the operation of natural law. Your reason is, that 'it cannot be otherwise, so long as effects follow causes,' &c. Does not this imply that such things are wrong in themselves considered, and that the infinitely wise, benevolent and omnipotent Jehovah cannot institute a system of physical law perfectly consistent with moral order? I hesitate not to affirm, that the Holy One will no more allow the elements of the physical world to operate in a manner inconsistent with righteousness, than he will command Gabriel to act inconsistently with righteousness. What God does by the operation of his own physical laws, he does himself. The natural elements, angels, men and devils, are all his messengers, and he has the same right to commission one as another to execute his righteous purposes. May I not then ask you, 'Did a just God ever inflict death (by his natural laws) upon one of

his children' as the consequence of the sins of another?

If so, as you acknowledge, why may not he inflict death by the instrumentality of man, as a consequence of the sins of another? You reply, because it is inconsistent with the—natural relations and obligations of man to man.' I ask how you prove this? I perceive no evidence of its truth. Do you think so because these relations and obligations require that men shall not kill each other? If this proves it, it must be on the principle that God is himself bound by the obligations of human relationship. But this is a false principle. Reason and the nature of things teach that different relationships should involve different obligations, and different degrees of authority. The infinite perfections of God give him a rightful authority over man, which man cannot have over his fellow; consequently, God is not bound by those laws which pertain to human relationships. The general law to man, 'Thou shalt not kill,' is founded in righteousness. Man is not the author or supreme owner of life, neither is he competent to determine when it is right to take it, admitting that in some cases it may be right. He has no right to take it without the command of the Giver and Supreme Owner of it.

Man's exclusive legislative power, exercised over both sexes, has caused the uncontrolled development of his coarser selfishness, and stifled his best moral qualities. Man is still under the influence of this immutable law. Woman, in her ignorant simplicity, neither knows the power nor the purpose of this law of nature. Let us exhibit the truth before the eyes of the women of America. It is their interest to understand the truth, and they will understand it, and set upon it. Then man will be restored to the full empire of this wise and benevolent law, and hence to his noblest moral feelings. Woman, restored to her social and civil rights, will also be restored to her moral dignity. The individual and social family will be soon brought into harmony and happiness; for the pivot being restored to its centre, all the parts of the social mechanism will be in equilibrium, and cannot help working well. Woman can bring about this fortunate change, and will, for she has the full power, and it is her own interest to do so. Until this is accomplished, it is folly to expect any improvement in the moral character of man. How can we demand of him to respect the dignity of his brother, when he legally outrages that of his mother, and no fault is found with him? How can we ask of a man a heart full of philanthropy for every one of his fellow-men, when he legally makes himself the bitterest foe of woman for whose welfare he had been created, and nobody finding fault? All the present reformers, however, like those of former times, leave this important subject, so deeply affecting the welfare of both sexes, to future generations.

Yours, respectfully,  
ANGELIQUE LE PETIT MARTIN.

[<sup>1</sup> The Essay, accompanying this letter, we shall publish in another number.]—ED. LIB.

physical strength which enables man to subdue woman, and make her subservient to his wishes, at the expense of her suffering and misery. They bitterly blame God and nature for so unjust and cruel an inconsistency. All these are blaspheming errors against God and nature, who have taken the most tender care of the female by associating her with an auxiliary, bound to her by attraction and love; and devoted to her, that he offers her the very essence of his existence. Ready to do or forbear—any thing to please her; whose strength is for her service, not for her oppression. If accidental circumstances, such as war, (which favored the unbounded gratification of his sexual love,) existed, they always saved the women, whilst the greater part of the men were destroyed. Man's exclusive legislative power, exercised over both sexes, has caused the uncontrolled development of his coarser selfishness, and stifled his best moral qualities. Man is still under the influence of this immutable law. Woman, in her ignorant simplicity, neither knows the power nor the purpose of this law of nature. Let us exhibit the truth before the eyes of the women of America. It is their interest to understand the truth, and they will understand it, and set upon it. Then man will be restored to the full empire of this wise and benevolent law, and hence to his noblest moral feelings. Woman, restored to her social and civil rights, will also be restored to her moral dignity. The individual and social family will be soon brought into harmony and happiness; for the pivot being restored to its centre, all the parts of the social mechanism will be in equilibrium, and cannot help working well. Woman can bring about this fortunate change, and will, for she has the full power, and it is her own interest to do so. Until this is accomplished, it is folly to expect any improvement in the moral character of man. How can we demand of him to respect the dignity of his brother, when he legally outrages that of his mother, and no fault is found with him? How can we ask of a man a heart full of philanthropy for every one of his fellow-men, when he legally makes himself the bitterest foe of woman for whose welfare he had been created, and nobody finding fault? All the present reformers, however, like those of former times, leave this important subject, so deeply affecting the welfare of both sexes, to future generations.

Yours, respectfully,  
ANGELIQUE LE PETIT MARTIN.

[<sup>1</sup> The Essay, accompanying this letter, we shall publish in another number.]—ED. LIB.

DR. CHARLES JEWETT,

The legal coadjutor Temperance Lecturer, closes a recent letter to the editor of the Cataract as follows:

'In view of the wide spread and damning results of that most infamous business, (runnagging,) I unhesitatingly declare, that if I possessed despotism power on this continent, I would bring it to a speedy end; or I would shorten the villainy engaged in it by the length of a head. Better that one should fall, than that fifty others should be bereft of brains, and rot on the bodies that support them, infecting the atmosphere of a whole region with pestilence, that must inevitably seize on the vital parts of the innocent and defenceless. If that last sentence be treason, then I will say with Patrick Henry, "make the most of it."

CHARLES JEWETT.

Hartford, Ct. Dec. 22d, 1848.

O, brother Jewett, if thy zeal is according to knowledge, it is not according to Christian Ruler over all? What wouldst thou do if thou were Supreme Ruler over all? What would become of us miserable sinners? But we are sure that thy words sound much more vindictive than thy heart feels.

I have considered your present position as subversive of the bearing of the Bible, as a divine revelation, and have asked, 'How can we confide in the Bible in other matters?' You reply, 'Simply, because, in other matters, it gives instructions in accordance with justice, equity, mercy and love.' Permit me to ask, if the fact of a man's giving some instructions in accordance with these principles, proves him to possess divine authority to foretell future events, and to reveal matters above human reason, though not contrary to it? Joe Smith gave some such instructions. Did this establish his claim to divine authority to assemble the saints at Naouvo? If Moses was mistaken in respect to God commanding him to slay the Canaanites, as you suppose, he certainly might have been mistaken in respect to God revealing to him that he would 'raise up a